UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,548	01/30/2001	Andrew Ahmad	Sprint 1538 (4000-01800)	9236

7590   09/12/2003

Steven J. Funk
Sprint Law Department
8140 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, MO 64114

EXAMINER
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 January 2001_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _30 January 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in

this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by
> another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent,
> or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of
> paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by
> the applicant for patent.

3.   Claim 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Apte et al.(6269373) (hereinafter Apte).

4.   As per independent claim 1, Apte discloses a method for setting

transactional behavior (Col 7, lines 43-48) for a CORBA (col 1, lines 51-54)

method, the method comprising:

a system remote (col 10, lines 4-6) from a client creating a transaction

policy (col 10, lines 8-26) by translating a deployment descriptor (col 7, lines

33-37) file;

the client calling a CORBA method (col 9, lines 65-67), wherein the

client resides on a system local to the client (col 10, lines 32-37), wherein

the CORBA method resides on the system remote from the client (col 9,

lines 30-32), and wherein the call comprises an IIOP (it is inherent because

IIOP allows objects operating over heterogeneous IIOP-compliant ORBs to

interact with each other, irrespective of the internal structure of the ORBs or

of any vendor-specific mechanisms) message (col 10, lines 32-37)wherein

the IIOP message includes a method name for the CORBA method called (col

10, lines 32-39);

an interceptor residing on the system remote from the client

intercepting the IIOP message (col 8, lines 10-16);

the interceptor residing on the system remote from the client reading

the method name from the IIOP message (col 8, lines 10-24);

the interceptor residing on the system remote from the client checking

the transaction policy for the system remote from the client with respect to

the method name (col 8, lines 10-24);

the interceptor residing on the system remote from the client either

invoking the called CORBA method directly (col 8, lines 10-24) or first

completing a control object interpositioning process (it is inherent because

the library interpositioning implementation of an interceptor can examine

and modify a process s behavior at the granularity of library routines) and

then invoking the called CORBA method where the choice is defined by the results of the check of the transaction policy with respect to the method name (col 12, lines 16-37).

5.   As per independent claim 2, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

6.   As per claim 3, Apte discloses the transaction policy (col 10, lines 8-26) created on the system remote from the client is created during deployment (col 7, lines 48-54) of the system remote from the client (col 7, lines 39-43).

7.   As per claim 4, Apte discloses the transaction policy (col 10, lines 8-26) created on the system remote from the client is created after receipt of the IIOP message (it is inherent because IIOP allows objects operating over heterogeneous IIOP-compliant ORBs to interact with each other, irrespective of the internal structure of the ORBs or of any vendor-specific mechanisms) to facilitate run-time comparison of the method name with the deployment descriptor file (col 7, lines 30-37).

8.   As per independent claim 5, Apte discloses a method for changing

transactional behavior (col 7, lines 43-48) for a CORBA method resident on a

server col 17, lines 30 –33); the method comprising:

defining transactional behavior for a CORBA (col 17, lines 30 –33)

method resident on a server in a transaction policy implemented on the

server (col 7 lines 30-31), wherein the transaction policy is translated from a

deployment descriptor file during deployment of the server (col 7, lines 30-

38), and wherein invocations of the CORBA method from client objects result

in a defined transactional behavior based on the transaction policy (col 8,

lines 10 23);

modifying the deployment descriptor file to change the transactional

behavior for the CORBA method on the server (col 7, lines 55-65);

redeploying the server which implements a modified transaction policy

translated from the modified deployment descriptor (col 7, lines 30 –37,

deployment tool must be used for the redeployment) file wherein identical

invocations from identical client objects (col 18, lines 44-52) result in a

different defined transactional behavior (col 12, lines 24-34, it is inherent

because that two similar objects can have different transactional behavior,

typecasting provides the mechanism to accomplish the task) for the CORBA

method on the server based on the modified transaction policy (col 7, lines

39-54).

9.   As per claim 6, Apte discloses the deployment descriptor (col 7, lines 33-37) file and the transaction policy translated (col 10, lines 8 – 26) from the deployment descriptor file define transactional behavior (col 7, lines 33-37) for more than one CORBA method resident on the server (col 10, lines 47-64).

10.   As per claim 7, Apte discloses the deployment descriptor (col 7, lines 33-37) file and the transaction policy translated (col 10, lines 8 – 26) from the deployment descriptor file define transactional behavior (col 7, lines 33-37) for all CORBA methods resident on the server (col 10, lines 47-64).

11.   As per claim 8, Apte discloses the deployment descriptor file (col 7, lines 33-37) is a text file (col 10, lines 19-26) and wherein the transaction policy is a table translated from the text file (col 10, lines 19-26, and col 16, lines 59-63, Database contains tables, it is implied that conversion from text-table or table-text file must have happened).

12.   As per claim 9, Apte discloses wherein the deployment descriptor (col 7, lines 33-37) file is stored on the server (col 15, lines 17-27).

13.   As per claim 10, Apte teaches the deployment descriptor file is stored

(col 7, lines 33-37) in a location remote from the server (col 17, lines 11-

17).

14.   As per claim 11, Apte teaches the deployment descriptor file is

translated by a plurality of servers to create the transaction policies for the

plurality of servers (col 18, lines 29-52).

15.   As per claim 12, Apte teaches a method for propagating transactional

context for a CORBA transaction (col 1, lines 51-54), the method

comprising:

a client calling a CORBA method (col 10, lines 32-37), wherein the

client resides on a system local to the client (col 9, lines 30-32), wherein the

CORBA method resides on a system remote from the client , wherein the call

comprises an IIOP message having a service context (it is inherent because

IIOP allows objects operating over heterogeneous IIOP-compliant ORBs to

interact with each other, irrespective of the internal structure of the ORBs or

of any vendor-specific mechanisms);

an interceptor intercepting the IIOP message (col 8, lines 10-16),

wherein the interceptor resides on the system local to the client (col 8, lines

10-16);

the interceptor residing on the system local to the client inserting an

object representing the transaction context on the service context of the

IIOP message (Col 8 , lines 10-38);

the interceptor residing on the system local to the client returning the

IIOP message to its original path (col 10 , line 39-42);

an interceptor residing on the system remote from the client

intercepting the IIOP message (col 8, lines 10-16);

the interceptor residing on the system remote from the client

extracting the object representing the transaction context from the service

context of the IIOP message (col 8, lines 10-24).

16.   As per claim 13, Apte discloses the interceptor residing (col 8, lines

10-16) on the system remote from the client completing a control object

interpositioning (it is inherent because the library interpositioning

implementation of an interceptor can examine and modify a process s

behavior at the granularity of library routines) process between the object

representing the transaction context and an OTS spanning (it is inherent

because Object Transaction Service (OTS) is a CORBA component to build

distributed enterprise applications requiring transactional semantics) both

the system local to the client and the system remote from the client and

then invoking the called CORBA method (col 10, lines 1- 42).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. Client/Server Programming with Java and Corba

Second Edition By Robert Orfali, Dan Harkey

ISBN 0-471-24578-X

b. Transparent Fault Tolerance for CORBA

by

Priya Narsimah

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

MAS